

CONFIDENTIAL
TOP SECRET

AD HOC IAC COMMITTEE (WATCH)

Transcript of Meeting Held in Director's
Conference Room, Administration Building
Central Intelligence Agency, on 29 January 1954

Mr. Huntington D. Sheldon
Presiding

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. William C. Trueheart, Office of the Special Assistant,
Intelligence, Department of State

Brigadier General John M. Willems, Deputy AC of S, G-2,
Department of the Army

Captain D. T. Eller (USN), Assistant Head, Intelligence
Branch, ONI, Department of the Navy

Brigadier General Millard Lewis, Deputy Director Intelli-
gence, Headquarters USAF, United States Air Force

Dr. Charles H. Reichardt, Intelligence Division,
Energy Commission Atomic

Colonel Neil M. Wallace, Joint Intelligence
Joint Staff (Substitute for Rear Admiral E. T. Layton)

Mr. Meffert W. Kuhrtz, Special Agent,
Federal Bureau of Investigation Liaison Section,

ALSO PRESENT

Lt. Col. James P. Barry, Department of the Army

Colonel Howard D. Kenzie, United States Air Force

Colonel George R. Hundt, United States Air Force

Mr. Samuel S. Rockwell, United States Air Force

Commander Robert B. Kail, Department of the Navy

25X1A [REDACTED] Secretary, CIA

25X1A [REDACTED] Reporter, CIA

| |
|--|
| Document No. <u>2</u> |
| No Change In Class. <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Declassified |
| Class. Changed to: TS S (C) |
| Next Review Date: <u>23/2/79</u> |
| Auth: <u>HR 70-3</u> |
| Date: <u>23/2/79</u> By: <u>360</u> |

CONFIDENTIAL

TOP SECRET

MR. SHELDON: I think we might as well deal with last time's Minutes.

Are there any proposed changes?

CAPTAIN ELLER: I would like to modify, Mr. Chairman, on the bottom of page 3. I think it clears up what I actually intended to say there a little bit better -- the second sentence there at the bottom of the page: "He felt sure that there had been times when . . . " Following "when" say "certain intelligence items having operational aspects have not been presented." I phrased it the other way, and it looked like there was more emphasis on operational than there should have been.

MR. SHELDON: We will gladly accept that. Are there any other suggested changes?

25X1A [REDACTED] May I have that again, please?

CAPTAIN ELLER: Starting with "when" say "when certain intelligence items having operational aspects have not been presented."

25X1A [REDACTED] Thank you.

MR. SHELDON: Any other changes? If not the Minutes will stand as circulated with the amendment made by Captain Eller.

Now we redirect our attention, I believe, to paragraph g. I think it was I that raised a question on g.

CAPTAIN ELLER: I didn't realize we had finished with f., Mr. Chairman. You remember we had quite a discussion as to whether the --

MR. SHELDON: Are we talking about new f?

CAPTAIN ELLER: Well, the f. on the 15 January draft. That was what I --

MR. SHELDON: That is the problem. Maybe that is what I am calling g.

COLONEL WALLACE: Yes, that is right.

CAPTAIN ELLER: Yes, you are right. I didn't get the new --

MR. SHELDON: The next time, Frank, get a clean piece of paper and start with so we won't have this kind of trouble.

25X1A [REDACTED] All right, sir.

MR. SHELDON: Now I raised a question on old f. new g., and what I am suggesting today is that we are perfectly willing to buy old f. new g. if the h.

TOP SECRET

TOP SECRET

as circulated is satisfactory to the Committee; in other words, it gets in the thought that we had on this particular matter. In other words, the point that I raised at the last meeting was that what would the Staff actually do? Now would they actually prepare specific drafts? And the general feeling in the Committee was No they shouldn't go to that extent. General Willems indicated that he didn't want to lose the substantive review and discussion with the members, and to overcome my thought that the Staff should have some participating feature in assisting the Committee, I would be perfectly willing to let f. g. stand as it was written provided that my concept which is set forth in h. is acceptable. It seems to me it gets around the major problem that General Willems was objecting to because you really have two steps and two functions to carry out. It avoids the criticism that was directed at our concept of the Staff coming up with canned items. It is not intended to mean that so to get away from the idea the Committee would simply act as a rubber stamp.

DR. REICHARDT: It certainly gives leeway to the individual Watch Committee members in relation to his particular staff.

MR. SHELDON: That is right. It seemed to me it is quite a happy solution to what we were arguing about or discussing the last time.

COLONEL WALLACE: In practice I know the Watch Committee members have never felt restricted by the printed agenda that we got at the meeting. If anyone had anything additional to bring up he was always perfectly free and encouraged to do so.

MR. SHELDON: Certainly. Well, does this help solve the road block we ran into last time?

COLONEL BARRY: I think perhaps, sir, in part the answer to that would lie with what then was done with g. and h. because these all sort of mesh together, the various steps in the operation of the Working Group.

MR. SHELDON: I am proposing that g. remain as originally drafted.

COLONEL BARRY: Well, I am sorry; it would be now h. and j., yes.

MR. SHELDON: Well, all right; in other words, you would like to see

TOP SECRET

TOP SECRET

what the other thoughts are on the succeeding paragraphs before you make any comment?

COLONEL BARRY: Yes, sir; in other words, how the whole process is envisaged rather than . . . though it is envisaged bit by bit.

MR. SHELDON: All right, well, then let us for the moment turn to what becomes i. if h. is temporarily left for further discussion. In other words, the old h. is "coordinate the reproduction and distribution of the Watch Committee reports in final form." I think, in general, that concept is perfectly acceptable as far as we are concerned excepting I would like to make one slight suggestion that it read, "coordinate the reproduction and dissemination of approved Watch Committee reports." It is the same concept only I think it tightens it up. It is simply a question of language. The spirit and thought back of it is the same.

CAPTAIN ELLER: Would you repeat the phraseology?

MR. SHELDON: "coordinate the reproduction and dissemination" rather than "distribution of approved Watch Committee reports." And I think that with that as the disseminating responsibility we can then go back and look at the new proposed g. or h. whichever you prefer.

COLONEL BARRY: In effect, sir, what this proposed h. is doing is avoiding a definite statement as to the exact mechanics and simply saying that the Working Group or Secretariat will --

MR. SHELDON: From time to time it certainly would and should for my money bring up certain pieces of paper which require to be dealt with.

COLONEL BARRY: Yes, sir, and this will leave to the --

MR. SHELDON: It puts a certain flexibility into the staff operation in its support of the individual Committee members and the Committee as a whole. That is the thought in this.

COLONEL BARRY: -- Committee itself the detailed decision as to just how the thing was done.

MR. SHELDON: Exactly.

(At this point Brigadier General John M. Willems entered the room.)

TOP SECRET

TOP SECRET

MR. SHELDON: How are you?

GENERAL WILLEMS: (to Lt. Col. Barry) Do you want to stay?

COLONEL BARRY: No, sir, I just wanted to finish the one sentence I started.

GENERAL WILLEMS: Excuse me for being late.

MR. SHELDON: Not a bit. We got to discussing last time, if you recall, General Willems, the old f. paragraph here, and there was a slight difference of view as to the functions between the Staff and the functions of the individual Committee members, and we had quite a talk along those lines, and I suggested that possibly I might be able to resolve those difficulties, and I have attempted to do so by agreeing that the old f. is perfectly satisfactory as far as we are concerned provided the new h., which we have circulated, is acceptable. We left the consideration of h. until we saw what the new i. or old h. would look like, and in that connection I suggested, and it was accepted by the members here, that we have it read, "coordinate the reproduction and dissemination of approved Watch Committee reports," simply a change in phraseology, but no change in the fundamental concept, and since that was agreeable to the Committee we then returned to examine old g. which I have circulated as -- or rather the h. which I have circulated -- and we had about reached a point, I think, where that seemed to meet with people's general agreement.

CAPTAIN ELLER: In connection with that, Mr. Chairman, I am in pretty much accord with the phraseology here now. We left out the matter -- the statement -- "and prepare the draft report and conclusions." We left that out the last time because of the feeling that we would be tying the hands of the Watch Committee a little bit and making it more stereotyped if we had a predrawn --

MR. SHELDON: This is my attempt to leave all of that matter in the hands of the Committee itself.

CAPTAIN ELLER: Exactly.

MR. SHELDON: But simply not estop the members of the Staff from submitting rough --

TOP SECRET

TOP SECRET

CAPTAIN ELLER: Yes.

MR. SHELDON: -- ideas and things of that sort which seems to me is their proper function.

CAPTAIN ELLER: Well, this statement -- the h. that you have here -- would still permit that, but it isn't indicated that that would be followed, so it would be just an open problem, and the only thing I would like to have it shown that we feel that the Watch report should not really be written up preliminarily in any fashion.

MR. SHELDON: It is not intended that that should be the case.

CAPTAIN ELLER: I understand. The other point in here, I would wonder if you wouldn't feel satisfied with this. Instead of "as a basis for" make it "to assist in". In other words, "prepare material for use by the Watch Committee to assist in its deliberations".

MR. SHELDON: That is perfectly all right; that is perfectly all right.

CAPTAIN ELLER: Yes, sir, I am in complete agreement.

MR. SHELDON: Is that satisfactory to the other members of the Committee?

GENERAL LEWIS: Yes.

GENERAL WILLEMS: "to assist in its deliberations".

MR. SHELDON: That reflects just exactly what we have in mind to give flexibility to the Staff and not to impinge on the Committee's prerogative.

CAPTAIN ELLER: Yes, sir, I thought --

MR. SHELDON: Right, and then that leaves us with the problem of trying to crank in here some experimentation with the gadgets, and in attempting to do that we have submitted j. as a tentative suggestion along those lines. I think in principle we have more or less all agreed that we want to keep this out of the day-to-day techniques unless and until something is developed, thoroughly tested, and accepted. We don't want to have anybody relying on gadgets until they are so thoroughly proven that they are beyond a question, which may never be the case. I think we have to say something about this type of a gadget somewhere in our paper. Don't you feel that --

TOP SECRET

GENERAL WILLEMS: Yes, I think the Watch Committee should have the advantage of all modern developments and aids that will assist it.

MR. SHELDON: Now we don't have any pride of authorship on this particular paragraph. It just expresses our feelings as to how this thing should be done and am entirely open to suggestions on it.

GENERAL WILLEMS: The only questionable part -- and I am sure it is not intended at all -- and maybe I am a little touchy having wound up on this Indications Board -- we say "with a view eventually to assist in accomplishing the Watch Committee Mission." I wonder if we are not over-emphasizing the "assist". I wonder if we might perhaps --

MR. SHELDON: "With a view possibly to assist" is what you mean?

GENERAL WILLEMS: That is what I mean, but when you write it down it looks kind of fuzzy.

DR. REICHARDT: This would help in my looking at it because I would propose that we put it experimentally or --

MR. SHELDON: You mean possibly.

DR. REICHARDT: Possibly and drop the experimental because to develop experimentally also means to test, and I think what you mean is you are experimenting on these things. You are developing in an experimental way, you see.

MR. SHELDON: That is right, but I still intend it to mean to test in an experimental way, to keep it out of the day-to-day techniques, and then if by some --

DR. REICHARDT: Right.

MR. SHELDON: -- chance something really proves itself, then you can at that time consider whether you want to crank it into your day-to-day operations.

DR. REICHARDT: What I was thinking, modification, General Willems, might allow you to drop the experimentally from where it is, which is somewhat awkward and doesn't cover your test completely either.

TOP SECRET

TOP SECRET

COLONEL WALLACE: Is what you are trying to say "to develop and test the mechanical aids on an experimental basis"?

DR. REICHARDT: This might be it and might help General Willems.

MR. SHELDON: That is all right.

GENERAL WILLEMS: Where you have "with a view eventually to assist" I might suggest something along the line, "to insure the benefit of such aids in accomplishing the Watch Committee mission."

MR. SHELDON: You want to go that strong? I mean I don't care how you write this frankly as long as we get the idea in. It doesn't make any difference to me.

GENERAL WILLEMS: That is what we are trying to get, isn't it? We want the Committee to have the benefit of all possible assistance in this field.

MR. SHELDON: Yes.

GENERAL WILLEMS: I thought the term --

MR. SHELDON: I was thinking again in terms of the man who is going to be running the shop, so to speak, and what does this make him do on a priority basis. He has to allocate his time and his means, and I thought maybe that might be too strong. Well, let's try that out anyway because . . . In other words, the first change suggested is to "develop and test mechanical aids on an experimental basis."

DR. REICHARDT: Or "aids and techniques on an experimental basis."

COLONEL WALLACE: "mechanical aids and techniques on an experimental basis."

MR. SHELDON: All right -- "to develop aids and techniques on an experimental basis." We are leaving the thought of testing them out then?

DR. REICHARDT: No, testing is still in there -- "to test and develop mechanical aids and techniques." It is just that to develop experimentally to me means also to test, and I think you wanted to emphasize the experimental basis for both things.

MR. SHELDON: Yes.

TOP SECRET

MR. KUERTZ: General Willems, using Dr. Reichardt's change there, "comma through aids and techniques on an experimental basis to aid in accomplishing the Watch Committee Mission," would that not fit your interest there to aid --

GENERAL WILLEMS: Yes, I think that would be --

MR. KUERTZ: Instead of "with a view eventually to assist on an experimental basis to aid in accomplishing the Watch Committee Mission"? I think that is your point, isn't it?

DR. REICHARDT: Well --

MR. SHELDON: Well, when you say "to aid in accomplishing the Watch Committee Mission," you don't then lay it on the line that that isn't cranked in at some time until it is proven. That is what I am afraid of.

DR. REICHARDT: Yes, I see that now.

COLONEL WALLACE: The thought I have just been thinking of here, "with a view to adopting proven techniques."

MR. SHELDON: That is the thought all right.

COLONEL WALLACE: With a view to adopting the proven ones.

GENERAL WILLEMS: The only thing is . . . well, I guess . . .

All we want to be sure of is that the Watch Committee takes advantage of those that really provide some assistance. Isn't that right?

MR. SHELDON: How about this?

GENERAL WILLEMS: Excuse me on the one point that if there is nothing that really is advantageous, we don't want the Watch Committee feeling bound to have some sort of gadgetry they don't have to use.

COLONEL WALLACE: That is what I had in mind when I say, "with a view to adopting proven ones."

MR. KUERTZ: Doesn't that infer that if that is adopted that is it from there on?

DR. REICHARDT: Yes.

COLONEL WALLACE: Later proved fallacious, why you can drop it.

CAPTAIN ELLER: After the first war.

TOP SECRET

TOP SECRET

MR. WALLACE: That is frankly one of the things I feel. If we, for instance, set up some mechanical gadgets and have them in operation on an experimental basis, and a full-fledged all out war suddenly falls in our laps, and that will be the proof of whether the system was good or not. After that it is not going to make any difference because we are either going to win or lose that war, and it will be so conclusively won or lost you won't need a Watch Committee for a long time. That may be a little extreme, but --

MR. SHELDON: Well, do we have any specific suggestions?

CAPTAIN ELLER: One thing that generally seems to fit in with the ideas we have discussed and seemed reasonable, that we want to be sure that we are not accused of entering the experimental field in a sort of a research matter and diverting any of our real attention from our primary duties. It would depend upon how much effort is going to be put by the Working Group on to this particular item.

MR. SHELDON: That is it. The Committee Chairman is going to have to give guidance I assume to the Chief of the Indications Center as to how much money is available and how many manhours can be spent on this kind of thing. You have got that problem to face when you write this paragraph in here.

GENERAL WILLEMS: There is that danger if you happen to have a Chairman who is a kind of gadgeteer . . . with this Charter he could really go to town on it.

CAPTAIN ELLER: I realize everyone likes to play with this. There is nothing more interesting than to have flashing lights.

COLONEL WALLACE: Well, I think what we are interested in is the type of thing that any operating office would develop just as a matter of course, of time and experience to help do its job. We do the same thing in our own offices now. Maybe there are personal things we do for the regulation of our own day to day activities, or a larger scale for our own offices, but they don't get into the broad research and development field at all.

MR. SHELDON: If you put anything in down here at all, and I think we have to because of a number of reasons why we should introduce this idea into

TOP SECRET

TOP SECRET

the paper, I don't see how unless you spell out specifically, and that is impossible, the man hours to be devoted and the money to be devoted . . . you have to rely on the common good sense of whoever is running this Center not to go overboard on it. I don't think you can spell it out.

CAPTAIN ELLER: Wouldn't it be perfectly possible that this same project could be undertaken right now and that we could conduct exactly this statement if the Watch Committee felt that it would profit us to do it?

DR. REICHARDT: We would have to yell for room, etc., etc.

MR. KUERTZ: Room and help, and we don't have permanent room, etc.

GENERAL WILLEMS: This was all part of that proposal?

MR. SHELDON: It was part of the original G-2 proposal, and I presume they have considered the manpower and space itself that would be necessary for such an attack on the problem and which, of course, should also be taken into consideration when we get to the point of how many bodies, etc., are needed for this Center. Well, who has something they want to offer specifically?

GENERAL WILLEMS: I have something. If we would start off and say, "to develop and test such mechanical aids and techniques on an experimental basis as will benefit the Watch Committee in the accomplishing of its mission" or "accomplishment of its mission".

MR. SHELDON: What bothers me about that is that you assume that a benefit must ensue whereas that might not be the fact.

GENERAL WILLEMS: No, you could put only in there "to develop and test only as would benefit".

MR. SHELDON: But you can't determine that until you have done some experimenting. I don't want to nitpick this at all, but . . . well, let me put it this way. If everybody else agrees to that language, I am willing to agree to it. I think it is an almost impossible paragraph to write frankly. You have all got the same end in mind. Again we are having language trouble.

TOP SECRET

CAPTAIN ELLER: The word "concurrently", I think, is very good there, and you didn't have it in your --

GENERAL WILLEMS: No, we didn't have that in --

CAPTAIN ELLER: -- statement, and I think the indication should be that it would not in any way interfere with the normal processes.

MR. SHELDON: That is what I tried to say. It separates the thing out, and you go on from there. How you go on doesn't make much difference as far as I am concerned in the language.

GENERAL WILLEMS: Why not take the first line of the original proposal "concurrently but not as a substitute for current methods of analysis and evaluation" and then go on? What I was trying to accomplish by this wording was to put sort of a guard up against it where we bring out the fact that in doing this and in developing this they must insure that it is a benefit to the Committee and doesn't give them sort of carte blanche authority to go ahead and experiment on a rather broad scale.

MR. SHELDON: Will we get any help if we go back to the original G-2 paper on this?

GENERAL WILLEMS: That is the one where we said "maintain wall maps, charts and other display material which will most effectively illustrate and interpret graphically the current situation and long-range trends . . .".

MR. SHELDON: Yes.

GENERAL WILLEMS: That might not have met the Air Force appreciation of what was involved here.

MR. SHELDON: I think this is spelled out perhaps in too much detail here, and after all we were pretty close to an agreement on this.

DR. REICHARDT: I like General Willems' ideas. I had a thing written down, and I have added one word to it which I hope expresses that. See whether this gives you the feeling we are trying to get at. The sentence we have, "aids and techniques on an experimental basis with a view to their eventual use in effectively assisting the Watch Committee in accomplishing its mission."

MR. SHELDON: I am perfectly willing to buy that.

TOP SECRET

DR. REICHARDT: I mean does that --

GENERAL WILLEMS: Would you read that again, Please?

DR. REICHARDT: Come down on the third line . . . right on through down to the third line, you see, as we changed it, "to develop and test mechanical aids and techniques on an experimental basis with a view to their eventual use in effectively assisting the Watch Committee in the accomplishing or accomplishment of its mission" -- either one. You see, if this puts all of your --

MR. SHELDON: What is the reaction to that suggestion?

DR. REICHARDT: I like General Willems', but I was just trying to help with the word, "benefit".

MR. SHELDON: Frank, I think you better check Mr. Trueheart's office and see. You have a full record here in any event.

GENERAL WILLEMS: I think we are pretty close back to the original here, aren't we?

DR. REICHARDT: The thing is we are getting very close back to the original, and it was just a matter of trying to get in . . . It is still not --

GENERAL WILLEMS: Just so we don't feel that the Committee is directed to develop gadgets. That is my only concern. I mean if there isn't anything that really appears to be extremely important to them . . . If it doesn't appear to be a definite aid and assistance to them, I don't think they should feel, well, that they have to go ahead and keep working in this field.

MR. SHELDON: You mean after a reasonable attack on the problem?

GENERAL WILLEMS: Yes; in other words, I would like to give the fellow who says, "Well, I don't think this really means anything," as strong a position as a man who wants to introduce a new kind of a gadget into the Watch Committee considerations.

COLONEL WALLACE: That is what I had in mind when I said that we might work in the idea within the limits of their time and resources, or words to that affect, to bring in that idea. That would keep them from embarking

TOP SECRET

on a lot of projects and getting diverted from their primary job of --

MR. SHELDON: I think you still have to leave that to the good judgment of the Committee Chairman and his cohorts. I don't see how you can write that in. You can't legislate common sense into this thing, can you?

COLONEL WALLACE: You can't go too far without running into money requirements which would put a strangle on it in a hurry.

MR. SHELDON: Well, do you have any improvement on --

GENERAL WILLEMS: No, not much. I would suggest that we go ahead and come up with a statement on this, and just consider it, and come back next week.

MR. SHELDON: Millard, do you have any comments?

GENERAL LEWIS: No.

MR. SHELDON: You are in general accord with it?

GENERAL LEWIS: Yes.

MR. SHELDON: Well, then let's simply try this out for size and go on. It is a very small matter of turning the words around just to give the right tone to this.

DR. REICHARDT: The more I look at it the more I like General Willems' idea of "benefit" in there.

MR. SHELDON: All right, well then that brings us down to old 1.

25X1A [REDACTED] They forgot it, and they are not sure whether he will be able to get over or somebody else will. (re Thrushcart)

MR. SHELDON: We will make the transcript available. I have a few minor suggestions to make on 1. I would propose "develop and operate on a current and continuing basis the Watch Committee Intelligence Plan for systematizing, energizing, and coordinating the world-wide collection by U. S. agencies of intelligence pertinent to the Watch Committee mission."

And my second suggestion would be that if that paragraph or something approximating it is satisfactory that we make that a.

COLONEL WALLACE: Make it what, sir?

MR. SHELDON: a.

TOP SECRET

TOP SECRET

GENERAL WILLEMS: Would you read it again, Mr. Chairman?

MR. SHELDON: Yes, "develop and operate on a current and continuing basis the Watch Committee intelligence plan for systematizing, energizing, and coordinating the world-wide collection by U. S. agencies of intelligence pertinent to the Watch Committee mission." I am not positive whether the word "intelligence" there is correct.

GENERAL WILLEMS: Couldn't we say "indications intelligence" there?

MR. SHELDON: I think we have to get the word "indications" in there.

GENERAL WILLEMS: "Indications intelligence"?

MR. SHELDON: Yes, I think that is correct. I think it is inherent in that paragraph that it obviously must be whatever plan is formulated has to be approved by the Committee, etc., and it is simply a question of where the continuous review of such a plan lies, and I think it lies certainly with the Staff guided by the Chairman and the Committee members. Any comments on that suggestion?

COLONEL WALLACE: I was just referring back to something I wanted to check on a moment here.

CAPTAIN ELLER: Mr. Chairman, I believe there is one phrase that I would like to see in there which to my mind at present is a little vague. "Systematizing, energizing, and coordinating," and I would like to add the phrase thereafter, "through proper channels the world-wide collection of U. S. agencies of indications." In other words, they are going to have to do it in some manner, and I believe they would need guidance as to how to go about it in order that they would not have too much of a free hand.

MR. SHELDON: I don't think I could ever object to anybody going through appropriate channels.

CAPTAIN ELLER: Or through proper channels. Through proper channels, I think, would be better than official. It sounds a little less formalized than --

MR. SHELDON: I can't possibly see any harm in that.

GENERAL WILLEMS: Would you like "appropriate"?

TOP SECRET

TOP SECRET

CAPTAIN ELLER: Appropriate.

GENERAL WILLEMS: I thought not to tie their hands too much. They might want to stick their necks out in an emergency.

CAPTAIN ELLER: Well, I see no objection in an emergency. This would be in a matter of routine that would be considering.

GENERAL WILLEMS: I was going to say "appropriate". That gives them a little more leeway.

CAPTAIN ELLER: Yes, I think "appropriate" would be perfectly proper.

MR. SHELDON: I am not certain what that adds to be sure because . . . Any further comments?

COLONEL WALLACE: Sir, the thing I was rolling over in my mind here was how much if at all that cuts into the mission of this Committee which by its mission is supposed to investigate these things, and the thing I am worrying about is whether we are telling this group to go ahead and do something that this present body was supposed to set up. But I am not sure of that.

MR. SHELDON: Wait a minute, let's get that settled here and now. Maybe there is a difference of opinion. It was not my view that this Committee would write the intelligence plan. It would seem to me appropriate to have the intelligence plan written by the Watch Committee. I think we would be here until a year from Christmas if we tried to write the intelligence plan.

COLONEL WALLACE: Well, what I had in mind was at some time there --

MR. SHELDON: I look upon this as a charter of what has to be done, and then there are certain responsibilities that flow from that, and one of the responsibilities would be that of preparing the intelligence plan.

COLONEL WALLACE: The reason I brought up the point is because there has been some thought, I know, that the Indications Center would have its own communication channels and its own ways of going out and getting things. I know, on the other hand, that has been talked down rather vigorously on certain quarters too, and I was worrying about whether this particular paragraph as now written would put on this Indications Center, if we call it that, the burden of going out and developing such a system which would be

TOP SECRET

TOP SECRET

going beyond their capabilities, I believe.

MR. SHELDON: Well, I don't think we can be all-wise in this Committee and foresee all of the problems that may confront the Indications Center or the Committee on any long-range basis, and it could well be at a given point that conditions were such where it might be advisable for the Indications Center Staff to recommend to the Committee that certain action be considered. That would simply give them the flexibility to make a proposal, and if the Committee in session decided that it was an inappropriate recommendation, well, it would die there. It seems to me you have to have the decisions made by the Watch Committee as to how it operates its Center. It seems to me that the Indications Center Staff, on the other hand, has got to have certainly the privilege to come up with stimulating ideas, if they have any, which the Committee would consider. Isn't that a reasonable interpretation of what we are trying to set up here?

CAPTAIN ELLER: Yes, I believe so, Mr. Chairman. The reason I did introduce "through appropriate channels" phrase in there was that the Chairman of the Watch Committee probably would not originate letters. I don't know whether General Willems has had occasion to write letters or not, but I foresee that unless we had some such limitation that in energizing and systematizing it might be necessary for the Chairman of the Watch Committee to originate requirements, and I think that would be undesirable for him to do it.

MR. SHELDON: Per se, you mean?

CAPTAIN ELLER: Per se. If he does it through any one of the IAC Committees or through the normal system, it would be perfectly reasonable and would be implemented.

COLONEL WALLACE: By referring back to the original G-2 proposal, their paragraph 1., I can see that my thought was primarily based on that rather than the new wording here, and I think particularly your "through appropriate channels" there would clarify that, and then there wouldn't be any question

TOP SECRET

of having the Indications Center be involved in setting up any channels of communication of its own.

MR. SHELDON: Any further comments on --

DR. REICHARDT: My present understanding of it is after we had considered all of these we were going to consider which would be --

MR. SHELDON: -- Committee charter or which would be Center.

DR. REICHARDT: -- Committee charter or which would be Center charter, and this would seem to be more Committee charter though the Center would aid it.

MR. SHELDON: What is the view on that aspect?

DR. REICHARDT: It is my own view only, of course.

GENERAL WILLEMS: We are getting back in the same old bind here. It is awfully hard to divide all of this.

DR. REICHARDT: I think that anything that we consider Committee charter would per se also be Center charter, but it was a question of giving the Center more authority than we really wanted to by putting it as specifically under certain things -- specifically under their charter -- such as, for instance, a new f. could very well be under the Center charter without any problems here.

MR. SHELDON: Well, I don't hold any strong brief of where it should be. It doesn't make an awful lot of difference to me where it is as long as we get the idea into the paper.

GENERAL WILLEMS: It certainly shouldn't be last.

MR. SHELDON: If we are talking in terms of relative importance of duties, it does seem to me perhaps it should come a little higher in the scale, that is all. Where it comes I don't think is too important. Timewise it is one of the first things presumably that would be tackled because it is fundamental to the operation. Well, why don't you gentlemen decide where it should go. I really don't have any strong preference either way excepting I think it is a very important aspect of the paper.

GENERAL WILLEMS: I would like to suggest that we try it for size, that if in writing up the notes if you --

TOP SECRET

MR. SHELDON: Why don't we do this? Why don't we put it first, and then we will circulate a redraft of this whole section of it. In other words, we get a whole new draft, and put it there, and then we can see how it hits us because sometimes when you read the whole paper through again, you may decide that it needs to be shifted some.

CAPTAIN ELLER: Mr. Sheldon, before we go on if I could bring up one more question in regard to the intent here in this paragraph. Wherever we use "on a continuous basis" I feel that that introduces a problem which is going to increase the personnel requirements if the Watch Committee has to perform the duty on its own with no assistance from the other agencies, and what I feel would be a little broader and a little more flexible basis would be to introduce the phrase, "develop and operate on a continuous basis in cooperation with the IAC agencies" with the idea --

MR. SHELDON: Good morning, Bill.

MR. TRUEHEART: Covered with shame I forgot this thing altogether.

MR. SHELDON: We have missed you. We felt, however, we should proceed, and we will try to . . . Supposing I fill you in at the end. I think that would be the simplest way.

MR. TRUEHEART: All right, I don't want to delay it.

CAPTAIN ELLER: To go back just a bit to the phrase, "operate on a continuous basis." With that given as a requirement to the Secretary it will force them into a 24-hour watch it seems to me with no leeway. However, if it would be "on a continuous basis in cooperation with the IAC agencies," I think it would give enough flexibility so it could be arranged depending on the situation at the time.

MR. SHELDON: Don't you think that is inherent in the phrase? How else can it be done?

CAPTAIN ELLER: The words are pretty specific, and, for instance, we have a watch in the Navy Department in connection with this -- continuous watch. We have a Duty Captain, a Duty Commander, and we have about four or five other officers on. Now they are supporting the Watch Committee, and on

TOP SECRET

TOP SECRET

a continuous basis, and that could be interpreted as a requirement for the Watch Committee itself -- for the Secretariat itself which would be a very much increased Secretariat as far as personnel goes, and would duplicate the existing mechanism that we already have.

MR. SHELDON: But we are addressing ourselves here to the intelligence plan; in other words, "to develop and operate it on a continuing basis," and the word "continuing" there was put there to imply that if you write a paper once that isn't the end of it. It should be reviewed and kept current in the light of experience and subsequent developments. I think maybe our context is a little different.

COLONEL WALLACE: There has been a difference. You used the word "continuous". You said "continuing". Is that correct, sir?

MR. SHELDON: Yes, all we are talking about here is, "Let's keep this intelligence plan up to date and alive." That is all we are trying to say here. I don't think that has any real bearing.

CAPTAIN ELLER: I am satisfied, yes. I see your point.

MR. TRUEHEART: What paper are we working on?

MR. SHELDON: What happened here in effect is this. I think I can help you.

MR. TRUEHEART: Well, go ahead. I think I have the gist of what you are talking about.

MR. SHELDON: Now that you are here I would rather have you right along with us.

MR. TRUEHEART: I don't seem to have my copy with me.

25X1A [REDACTED] I have one, Bill.

MR. SHELDON: Briefly, Bill, what has happened here is that last time we were discussing paragraph f. of this particular draft, and I had certain reservations on that paragraph, and then as a result of presenting h., which is before you, I then said that as far as we were concerned we would be glad to accept f. provided the Committee accepted h.

MR. TRUEHEART: h.?

TOP SECRET

TOP SECRET

MR. SHELDON: h. h. has been accepted with the amendment as follows:
"prepare material for use by the Watch Committee to assist in its deliberation and the formulation of its conclusions".

Then we considered old h. which becomes new i., and with these minor amendments was accepted "coordinate the reproduction and dissemination of approved Watch Committee reports". Then we dealt with trying to crank the mechanical gadgets and aids into the program, and if you will look at j. which is by your--

MR. TRUEHEART: Yes.

MR. SHELDON: It was accepted for size with the understanding that there were certain minor rephrasings necessary which we would kind of think over during the next week, and, Frank, will you be sure that a clean copy is gotten out on that.

25X1A

Yes.

MR. SHELDON: But I don't think you need waste your time on that at the moment. And then we reached i., and i., has been tentatively agreed to read as follows: "develop and operate on a current and continuing basis the Watch Committee intelligence plan for systematizing, energizing, and coordinating world-wide collection by U.S. agencies of indications intelligence pertinent to the Watch Committee mission," and then we inserted the wording, "through appropriate channels".

COLONEL WALLACE: That came after the word "coordinating".

MR. SHELDON: After the word "coordinating". And that is the point we have reached now. The next query was whether or not that particular paragraph, since it was an important function of the whole picture, should not be placed higher up in the scale of duties, and we decided that what we would do would be to issue a clean paper, and then we could all have a look at it and see where it fitted best.

MR. TRUEHEART: It could be taken to mean, I suppose, the whole function of the Working Group comprised in this?

TOP SECRET

MR. SHELDON: Well, then we will circulate the clean piece of paper for consideration at the next meeting, and I assume then that we should try to take a step further and deal with such things as composition, location, and things of that sort. Isn't that our next task here? Are we all agreed that that is the next attack on the problem? In other words, who is going to be represented, and where is it going to operate, and the like?

MR. TRUEHEART: I seem to recall that we were going to go over these things again to see whether some of them should apply to the Watch --

MR. SHELDON: That is right, Committee duties or Indications Center duties. I think we can do that when we look at the clean piece of paper.

MR. TRUEHEART: Yes.

MR. SHELDON: And we can come here with our own ideas as to how to set that up the next time, I think. Well, I know of no better way of tackling the next problem than going back to the original suggestion that we made on the 20th of October on composition and membership. Supposing we tackle that as a point of departure.

COLONEL WALLACE: 20 October or 20 November?

MR. SHELDON: Well, the first draft circulated was 20 October, '53. It was the --

COLONEL WALLACE: Yes, I have found it.

MR. SHELDON: It was the paper from which most of this discussion has stemmed. I don't think we need deal at the moment with where in the paper this should rest, but I am sure it should rest somewhere early in the paper. That is a final drafting problem. I take it we are all agreed there should be a Chairman of the Watch Committee. I don't think anybody will argue along those lines, will they? There must be a Chairman of the Committee. Now the idea that we tried to introduce in this old b. of the 20 of October paper was briefly this. Our feeling is that the Watch Committee must have the maximum of support and priority among all of the IAC agencies, and we simply raised the question as to whether that cannot be engendered

TOP SECRET

TOP SECRET

by a concept of a rotation over a period of time, and that is the reason why we wrote it this way for a specified period. What are the members' views on a proposal along those lines?

DR. REICHARDT: From my own standpoint my present viewpoint is the rotation would preferably be limited to at least leaving us out.

MR. SHELDON: I wasn't suggesting how the rotation should be accomplished or anything of the sort, but in general as a principle we would tend to favor some technique of rotation without at the moment having any very fixed ideas as to who, or how, or for how long, or anything along those lines.

DR. REICHARDT: I was thinking purely if rotation worked up that we could very well --

MR. KUERTZ: I think the selection of the IAC would accommodate that point. There may be a time when you would be proper for it.

MR. SHELDON: You can't anticipate those things.

MR. TRUEHEART: It is the people's choice.

COLONEL WALLACE: Right now the Chairman is appointed and stays until he gets a change of assignment. Isn't that the way it is?

GENERAL WILLEMS: He is appointed by the Chairman, the Director of Central Intelligence.

MR. SHELDON: He is appointed by the Chairman of the IAC who under the present statutes is the DCI. This proposal here that we put forward was that he would in effect be appointed by the IAC as such rather than by an individual.

GENERAL WILLEMS: I think that ought to be. It seems to me what we should indicate here is the IAC should designate the Chairman.

MR. SHELDON: That is our feeling that it shouldn't rest solely in the discretion of an individual.

GENERAL WILLEMS: Yes, but I mean whether or not we want to put in this arbitrary requirement of rotation. Don't misunderstand me. I am sure that I will be gone from the Washington scene before I am involved. There is no

TOP SECRET

TOP SECRET

personal interest in this, but sometimes if you write into a charter that there has to be rotation there is some difficulty because it is a fixed matter that has to be sort of complied with. If you leave it to the judgment of the IAC it would seem to me it would give them a little more flexibility, and you would insure that they have the man that they feel most competent to be the Chairman heading the effort up.

MR. SHELDON: Well, I think that is one side of the coin. The other side of the coin is that in the long run I think there is a desirability. We feel that there should be a stated rotational concept set forth.

MR. TRUEHEART: Does the location of the Center affect this matter of rotation?

MR. SHELDON: If you want to deal with the location first, and then deal with these other aspects later, that will be perfectly all right with me.

MR. TRUEHEART: Is it pertinent? I mean is the material --

MR. SHELDON: It might be, yes, it might be.

GENERAL WILLEMS: I don't think it has to be though. I don't think it has to be.

MR. TRUEHEART: I just wondered, for example, if let's say we decided, well, the State Department would maintain the Center, would be located in the State Department Building. Would it be efficient to have the Chairman from the Navy, for example? Could he properly carry on his duties; in other words, unless the Center were very close by? That is the question.

MR. SHELDON: Well, it seems to me fundamental to this operation that the locus of the Center should be in the Pentagon. It seems to me reasonably clear as far as I am concerned. I think that is the proper place for it.

MR. TRUEHEART: I would certainly agree. I hasten to add that we are not making any bid at all.

MR. SHELDON: Does anybody feel differently on that score? Does anybody feel differently on that score? Are there any contrary views as to where the best location for it is?

TOP SECRET

COLONEL WALLACE: You are speaking of the Watch Committee itself to hold its meetings, or are you taking in the Indications Center as well?

MR. SHELDON: I am talking about the Indications Center because I look upon them as a kind of a team that is interrelated, and one supports the other, and I look upon it as a unit really.

COLONEL WALLACE: The view we had in the paper we put out initially last fall -- a long mimeographed paper -- the Indications Center should be in CIA.

MR. SHELDON: That did not set very well with CIA. I don't think that is the right way to run it either.

MR. KUHRITZ: I would think the Committee as such would have to meet where its tools are in the Center.

MR. SHELDON: I think that is for sure. I think the whole thing is part and parcel of the same problem. I think the locus is obvious, and I think that we can settle that now. Maybe we can go on with the other problems.

CAPTAIN ELLER: As the Watch Committee of the IAC, it would seem that if an emergency arose of sufficient gravity to meet continuously that we would need to be in the vicinity.

MR. SHELDON: You have a communications problem, and you have --

CAPTAIN ELLER: We would need to be in the vicinity of the IAC I would judge.

MR. SHELDON: Just because the IAC happens to meet here doesn't follow I don't think.

MR. TRUEHEART: It is easier to move the IAC than it would be to move the Center.

CAPTAIN ELLER: I wanted to bring that point up.

MR. SHELDON: I can see a condition if there was an emergency the IAC might meet continuously in the Center.

MR. TRUEHEART: The Center I can see having a lot of files, etc.

MR. SHELDON: You have a lot of tools to work with, and the IAC might want to go into this Center and have a look at this on a . . . It seems to be

TOP SECRET

TOP SECRET

quite obvious where the Center should be and where the meetings of the Committee should be. It is the center of the military problem.

MR. KUERTZ: Well, if you are wanting an expression on stands, I think in view of the present communication structure, etc., I certainly go along with you on its location at the Pentagon.

MR. SHELDON: I don't think there is any argument myself.

MR. TRUEHEART: That being the case, is it really efficient to have a Chairman from anything other than the Pentagon? I just wonder how somebody sitting in CIA or State could exercise any supervision over the staff which I gather we expect the Chairman to exercise.

MR. SHELDON: Well, you are suggesting in effect that the rotation should be one designed to rotate as between the three services and the Joint Staff?

MR. TRUEHEART: Or that you simply have an Executive Agent on this problem.

MR. SHELDON: Yes, I am perfectly agreeable to that. It is no thought on our part of anything different from that.

MR. TRUEHEART: I would be glad to go along with a rotating Chairman -- don't misunderstand me -- all the way around if that is the view of the majority, but I just thought it wouldn't be inefficient perhaps to have to do it that way.

MR. SHELDON: Well, as General Willems points up so well, it is a working team, don't you see, that you have got there. You have got your tools, etc., and it is quite obvious to me your Center must be in the Pentagon. Following your line of thought, I think since this is largely a military problem, it seems to me that the Chairman should be from the Services or from the Joint Staff as the case may be. We certainly have no desire to participate in the Chairmanship of the Committee. And while it is conceivable at some time that . . . you can't never tell.

MR. TRUEHEART: I wonder if the best thing to do would be to leave it completely flexible as your wording does, does it not? You don't say anything

TOP SECRET

about rotating.

MR. SHELDON: Yes, you do when you say a specified period. That in effect involves a rotation, don't you see?

DR. REICHARDT: At least a consideration periodically anyway which generally involves a rotation.

MR. SHELDON: I still think a rotational aspect is desirable.

COLONEL WALLACE: Well, I didn't read the implication of a rotation in there. In effect, the Chairman might get another vote of confidence as it were and continue for another specified period here, whatever it was selected for.

MR. SHELDON: Well, since this for my money largely is a service problem, if we are agreed that it belongs in the Pentagon, and I hear no dissenting voices on that score, then I would think that there should be some provision made for rotation between the four elements of the IAC which represent the military and who have their locus in the Pentagon. Is there any strong objection to that around the table?

GENERAL LEWIS: I don't think that is a particularly good idea. I would just as leave leave it the way it is -- leave it open.

MR. TRUEHEART: Let the IAC decide whenever they want --

DR. REICHARDT: We can only make recommendations to the IAC anyway, so it is naturally their decision.

MR. TRUEHEART: I mean leave it the IAC would approve a place and decide on an ad hoc basis what they are going to do about a chairman.

MR. SHELDON: A Chairman to be appointed by the IAC for a specified period. Is that bought all around --

MR. KUERTZ: Bought.

MR. TRUEHEART: To be understood that this did not mean rotation and didn't mean no rotation; it was completely open.

MR. SHELDON: Leave it entirely open; it is all right by me.

CAPTAIN ELLER: I had a recommendation on that, Mr. Chairman, that we indicate that a minimum and maximum time might be proper, although I didn't feel too strongly about it. I thought I would bring it up.

TOP SECRET

TOP SECRET

MR. SHELDON: It would be interesting to know what your thoughts were on that. I have no set figures in my mind.

CAPTAIN ELLER: Well, between two and three years -- a minimum of not less than one and probably two, and a maximum of approximately two to three as a starting point.

GENERAL WILLEMS: Well, there again it seems to me we are legislating the IAC.

MR. SHELDON: You are putting guidelines to the IAC if you do that.

GENERAL WILLEMS: Why don't we just say --

MR. SHELDON: If you want to leave it flexible let's leave it flexible without putting any thoughts in their minds.

GENERAL WILLEMS: Yes, and just put the period after IAC -- Chairman to be appointed by the IAC. Then if they don't like a Chairman, he is not delivering the goods or something about him perhaps -- there might be something about him why they might not want to continue him -- they have the authority to appoint a new Chairman.

MR. SHELDON: I think you give the IAC a greater flexibility if you put in a specified period.

GENERAL LEWIS: I think it is closer to what you want than if you leave it out.

MR. SHELDON: I think you are better off . . . I think it is more flexible if you make a specific tour out of this.

GENERAL WILLEMS: You feel that if somebody is in there, and they don't want to change him unless he is --

MR. SHELDON: Or per contra they might want to change him, and then if there is a specified time it is easier to make a change than if there is no specified time.

CAPTAIN ELLER: Well, it would appear hurtful to the Watch Committee to change chairmen at any frequent rate. That would be one possible desirability of having a minimum in there. That would be the only thing, but the IAC will do it.

TOP SECRET

TOP SECRET

MR. SHELDON: If we leave in here "for a specified time", then it is up to the IAC to determine themselves what they think a proper specified time is. They might say that so and so is proposed for a two-year period, and if that didn't meet with the IAC's views -- anybody on the IAC -- then they could discuss it at that time. I think this gives the IAC the greatest possible flexibility. All right on that?

Now to follow the language of what we had written here. Maybe the word "Executive Secretary" is not really what we have set up here. It is Chief of the Working Group of the Indications Center. That is perhaps more near the phraseology. It sounds cumbersome but --

MR. TRUEHEART: Would this man be a member of the Committee himself?

MR. SHELDON: Well, I think that is open for discussion.

MR. TRUEHEART: I mean was it your intent that he be a member?

MR. SHELDON: No, it was not; he would simply be . . . If you are going to have an Indications Center you have to have a Chief of it, I assume, and that was simply who is going to be the Chief of the Center, and then he simply takes his directions from the Chairman and in consort with the Committee members.

GENERAL WILLEMS: I believe it would be better if he definitely were not a member of the Committee.

MR. SHELDON: We had no concept that he would be.

MR. TRUEHEART: I think you might just drop that part down to the part where you describe the Center then since it suggests to me that from the title, composition, and membership it suggests to me that this man was meant to be a member.

GENERAL LEWIS: Well, I have a recommendation there. I think that the paragraph is a little fuzzy as to just what you are talking about, and I would think that it would be desirable to put a new title on the paragraph and call it "Organization and Composition of the Watch Committee." Then in your first sentence you would say essentially what you have already agreed to here except that I don't think you have gotten to the part about the senior official

TOP SECRET

representing each IAC organization have you?

MR. SHELDON: No, we haven't gotten that far, but --

GENERAL LEWIS: But assuming that is generally agreed, the first sentence would talk about the Watch Committee being composed of a Chairman to be appointed by the IAC for a specified period and the senior official representing each IAC organization, and then the second sentence talking about the fact that the Committee will be supported by an Indications Center.

MR. SHELDON: Yes.

GENERAL LEWIS: Indications Center which would be headed by a Chief or an Executive -- whatever you want to call him, so and so, and so and so. See?

MR. SHELDON: I think that expresses the picture very neatly. I would buy that approach to the problem. Does anybody feel differently on that score? Well, let's do this then. Let's see if we can reach a definition -- maybe not officially -- but let's talk a little about the senior official representing each IAC organization, and then we might ask Millard to come up with a redraft of this paragraph for the next meeting. All right?

GENERAL LEWIS: Yes.

MR. SHELDON: We did have some discussion at the last meeting on level of representation, and there didn't seem to be an entire unanimity of opinion on that. Perhaps we might readdress ourselves to that facet.

GENERAL LEWIS: Well, the way I have this thing constructed now. Your first sentence is going to talk about who is on the Watch Committee, not who is in the Center.

MR. SHELDON: Yes.

GENERAL LEWIS: In other words, your first sentence says that the Watch Committee will be composed of a Chairman, see, and a senior official representing each IAC organization. And not talking about the Center. In the second sentence you talk about the Center.

TOP SECRET

TOP SECRET

MR. SHELDON: Then you go on. Your next sentence, "The Chairman will be appointed by the IAC for a specified period."

GENERAL LEWIS: No, the first sentence reads, "The Watch Committee will be composed of a Chairman to be appointed by the IAC for a specified period and a senior official representing each IAC organization." The first sentence is clearly talking about who is on the Watch Committee, not who is in the Center.

MR. TRUEHEART: I understand.

GENERAL LEWIS: See. Then the only thing that the second sentence talks about is the Committee would be supported by the Center which is headed by so and so, and it consists of an Administrative Secretariat and an Indications Group -- two portions. The Secretariat on one side and the Working Group on the other side, see, and that shows you what the organization is and composition of the Watch Committee, but it goes farther than that and tells something about the Center which supports the Watch Committee. Then you get into the details back here and further on in the paper, you see.

MR. SHELDON: That seems like a clean concept.

GENERAL LEWIS: So when you are talking about a senior official representing each IAC organization, you are talking about the Watch Committee and not the Center here, so it is a question of who wants on the Watch Committee.

MR. SHELDON: Right.

MR. TRUEHEART: Was it your thought we ought to have more a definition of what a senior official was?

MR. SHELDON: Only informal. We were having an informal discussion last time which was inconclusive. If and when Millard circulates this paragraph for us, and the wording "senior official representing each IAC organization" becomes a satisfactory statement to all of us, it doesn't require any further definition in the paper itself, but I simply feel personally that it is desirable for us to have an idea as to what general level that senior official would be to give the necessary stature to the Watch Committee. We discussed it informally at the last meeting, and there were

TOP SECRET

TOP SECRET

some slightly divergent views expressed, and I thought it might be profitable to continue that discussion a little and see if we could come nearer to a meeting of the minds on it. Not that it would affect the paper per se, but it might affect the subsequent action if we had an exchange of ideas along these lines, and it would be easier for us each to make nominations to the Committee when the time came.

MR. TRUEHEART: Yes.

GENERAL LEWIS: Well, I have some very definite feelings, but I just don't, and I can tell you why, but I really think the important thing for the moment is to decide not so much about the senior, but does each member of the IAC want the right to have a member on it so that we can go ahead and discuss the other elements of this paragraph and get the elements of the whole paragraph settled so we can redraft it and get on with it? The question of senior I have thought about a very great deal since we last met, and I am convinced of one principle that you are going to have to have a considerable differential between your representation on the Center and on the Committee. Now the differential can be in various terms. You can talk about differential in rank maybe and maybe not. Maybe that in some instances won't make any difference, but I think maybe it does make a difference. Certainly differential in experience may also be another element, and I am reasonably sure that differential in the structure in your organization makes a big difference because you are going to find that the man who is working in the Center is isolated to that sole problem whereas the man on the Committee ought to be a broader man, broader scope man, a man who has an opportunity to see intelligence in a much broader picture. If he is just another individual like the man on the Center . . . say, for instance, we put a Colonel -- now take Air Force -- over here. If the Colonel is a we will say good, sharp Colonel, which I hope he would be, and say he gets in this Center and he sees this little world that he is in, which is relatively small compared with the whole intelligence analysis business. And then on the Committee is another Colonel who does not have the opportunity to see much more than he has seen, and working in this Center. Then the Committee,

TOP SECRET

TOP SECRET

you see, isn't going to be much better than having the Center people act as the Committee. Now I just want to toss that in for you all to chew on in your thinking about this question of senior. I don't think that we should necessarily try to settle it today. As a matter of fact, I think I would think about it some. In summary the principle is, in my opinion, that there has to be considerable differential between the Committee and the Center or else you are not going to gain very much by having a Committee sitting on top of a bunch of smart people in the Center. So how do you get that differential? And, of course, you want this Committee to have the maximum possible stature.

MR. TRUEHEART: I think that point is extremely well taken. The only qualification I would have would be you can't have so much of a differential that your top man is not substantively concerned with intelligence but is simply an administrator.

GENERAL LEWIS: In our case I would think we would certainly want . . . You see, we are organized into branches, and then into divisions, and then into the entire estimates. There is a man sits on top of all of the estimating business, you see, so here he is. He has divisions under him working on various kinds of estimates, and then here are the people through the shop down here who are pulling all of this material out and working on a problem. Now if the man on this Committee isn't fairly high up in this structure he isn't going to get to look at the big picture, you see, so he isn't going to be of much more help than the man that is already working in the Center, and that has been unquestionably the big advantage of having General Willems, you see, on a fairly high level, being on the Committee and being Chairman of the Committee, but particularly being on it because he is up here, and he can back off from some of these trees and see the woods, and he has other things that he gets from day to day that generally fit into the picture and maybe make him much more stable and less apt to react to some little thing that happened somewhere, which he can obviously see is of no particular consequence in the big picture.

TOP SECRET

I would suggest that we try and discuss the rest of the elements though here and leave the senior word for further discussion later, particularly here if we could get on with the rest of it here, the official representing each IAC organization.

MR. SHELDON: Well, is there anybody who does not feel that each member of the IAC should not have a member on the Committee, and per contra does any member of the IAC not wish to participate? I would doubt that that were the case. Is there anybody that would not wish to be represented? If we can take that for granted, so that the language that you proposed, Millard, I think is going to meet with reasonably good acceptance on that. So that in effect there seems to be unanimity on the composition of the Committee and on the method by which the Chairman is appointed, in addition to which I think we have all agreed that the locus of the operation should rest in the Pentagon. I think we have made a fair amount of headway on that. Is that a reasonably correct summary of what everybody feels? No dissent on that score?

MR. TRUEHEART: I would have thought we all agreed on what General Lewis said about the --

MR. SHELDON: I was coming to that next because he intimated he might want us to think it over rather than have any further discussion at this time on it. I think his concept is important, and I think we should all give full thought to it. Everybody may not be prepared at this moment to come up with a yea or nay on it.

DR. REICHARDT: We go along. I am just raising the question which probably has occurred to all of you. Presently the Watch Committee, of course, has General Willems as Chairman, and then he has more or less an Army member there. At least he presents the data. And the IAC, of course, Mr. Dulles is Chairman of, but Dr. Kent presents the CIA part of the thing, or at least the ONE part of the problem, and you get on some of the other Committees, and, of course, what you have is the Chairman acting as his own representative.

TOP SECRET

MR. TRUEHEART: Well, there isn't any question that Mr. Dulles is the CIA member of the IAC.

DR. REICHARDT: Well, true, and there is no question that General Willems is not the Army member, but what I meant was that you have here the membership, you see, would be a Chairman and a senior official representing each IAC organization which would --

MR. SHELDON: You are raising a point as to whether --

DR. REICHARDT: -- give the Chairman two votes if he was actually a member.

GENERAL WILLEMS: That is a good point.

MR. TRUEHEART: It is not the kind of thing we are voting on as much as place.

MR. SHELDON: It seems to me that is academic. I personally would have assumed the Army would have its member . . . Specifically, in other words, that . . . let's take an instance. Supposing the Navy had the Chairmanship at this given point. I would assume the Navy would have a representative there too.

GENERAL LEWIS: You don't at the JIC. What is the difference between this and the JIC on a lower level?

GENERAL WILLEMS: It is a good point. Actually I think it would keep a little better balance if you didn't have another vote in there on the Chairman's side.

GENERAL LEWIS: JIC whoever is the senior man present just simply acts as the Master of Ceremonies, but he is primarily there to represent his service.

MR. SHELDON: Well, I am interested in the service point of view on this thing because I am going to assume it is going to be the services that are going to provide the Chairman. As far as I am concerned it doesn't make any difference.

GENERAL WILLEMS: The only point is that then the IAC is selecting the member from the Agency who is going . . . If they are designating the

TOP SECRET

TOP SECRET

Chairman they select a representative then from the Agency.

MR. KUERTZ: Well, if you are going to spell out a voting schedule there I think it would be very simple just to express that each IAC agency has one vote whether the Chairman votes for that agency or a member. It is still one vote for the agency, and --

GENERAL WILLEMS: I think that is a better approach to it.

GENERAL LEWIS: Wouldn't have one vote each on IAC in settling on an intelligence estimate.

DR. REICHARDT: I didn't mean as a vote.

MR. SHELDON: I didn't think we should introduce the vote aspect into this paper frankly.

MR. TRUEHEART: I think you can clarify all of these points by rephrasing a little bit to say, "The Committee shall consist of a senior representative from each IAC agency, one of whom shall be designated Chairman by the IAC. This enables each agency to select its own members for the Committee, and yet the IAC would still select the Chairman, and I dare say if you wanted to it could be worked out that say the Navy would designate their member, and knowing full well that the IAC was going to name a Chairman later on if there was a question of rank involved or something like that.

CAPTAIN ELLER: I am sure that that would be of assistance to the Committee itself in order to have . . . I believe it helps to have the Committee Chairman more senior possibly. It might not make a difference, but I believe -- it seems to me -- it is a very logical way to have it, and I agree with the idea that you expressed, Mr. Trueheart.

MR. TRUEHEART: Our people have always felt very strongly that it was most important you have a general officer chairing this Committee.

MR. SHELDON: That might be a device actually whereby the difference in levels would be achieved.

DR. REICHARDT: Well, this is one of the reasons I brought it up and one of the things I was thinking of last week. I thought of level.

TOP SECRET

MR. SHELDON: Well, you are going to circulate that before the next meeting, Millard, or will we get it at the next meeting?

GENERAL LEWIS: No, I will circulate it. I will turn the sentence around. I will circulate it before the next meeting, and let's try to settle on the rest of this so we can get the whole thing drafted up at once.

MR. SHELDON: I haven't got your next sentence in exact --

GENERAL LEWIS: Well, the structure of the next sentence is that the Committee will be supported by an Indications Center headed by an Executive to be provided by so and so and consisting of an Administrative Secretariat and an Indications Group or whatever the technical names are for these people.

MR. SHELDON: I think that concept as far as I am concerned is perfectly satisfactory. How does the Committee feel on that concept as expressed by General Lewis? Does anybody wish to comment on it?

COLONEL WALLACE: I would like to ask a question. At what point will we stipulate what the composition of that Indications Center will be, or the membership of that?

GENERAL LEWIS: Well, I think you can do that back here in the back where you get to talking about the Center. You can then get to talking about its composition in detail, see.

COLONEL WALLACE: Right.

GENERAL LEWIS: But I think the important thing to do here is very simply and cleanly talk about the Committee and then talk about the general organization of the Center so that you can make it clear that you have two separate activities one supporting the other.

COLONEL WALLACE: Yes, sir.

MR. SHELDON: Do I read your sentence . . . Do I understand it correctly to mean that the senior of the Working Group would be the boss of the "administrative aspect of it and the substantive aspect equally"?

GENERAL LEWIS: Yes, whoever the Executive is is going to be the boss of it.

TOP SECRET

TOP SECRET

MR. SHELDON: He will run the two boxes?

GENERAL LEWIS: Yes, here I picture here you start up with the Committee, and then a line running down to the --

MR. SHELDON: Center.

GENERAL LEWIS: -- center structure, but it actually runs into a box marked "Executive", and then there are two boxes off of him. One of them is "Administrative Secretariat" and the other is the "Indications Group". I think it is highly desirable to separate the two.

MR. SHELDON: You could put different types of bodies would be necessary in each case. How does that concept meet with your thoughts? How does that meet with your thoughts?

MR. KUERTZ: I think that is very wise, and I might suggest that in our draft we could set up a little box of that sort just for clarification and understanding.

MR. SHELDON: It strikes me as a good, workable, clean-cut proposal from an operating point of view. General Willems, would you favor that?

GENERAL WILLEMS: It looks good to me, and I think we ought to have it come out and try it for size.

GENERAL LEWIS: Well then what we will do is to . . . We will fix up this paragraph as far as we have gone and put a little picture on there of just what the structure would look like.

MR. SHELDON: I think that is fine.

COLONEL WALLACE: That was what you brought out, I believe, in this 4 December meeting. I know looking back here . . . Isn't that what you --

GENERAL LEWIS: I have had this in mind for a long time.

COLONEL WALLACE: I thought I recalled seeing such a picture when you started describing.

MR. SHELDON: I think we have made some progress this morning. Time is short now. It is near our normal adjournment time, and I suggest that we call it a day.

TOP SECRET

CAPTAIN ELLER: Mr. Chairman, I have a draft which I prepared sometime back on a suggested version for the Preamble. If you remember I felt we might state it. I might submit this, and when the future drafts come up . . . It is not significantly different from the other one; however, we felt the wording would be a little more --

MR. SHELDON: I think we would very much like to see that. Frank, will you control the distribution on that.

CAPTAIN ELLER: I think there are enough copies here for --

MR. SHELDON: That will give us some more homework to do.

MR. TRUEHEART: I would like to tell the Committee that Mr. Evans is back on duty now and may well be picking up his torch.

MR. SHELDON: In other words, he had the one cataract --

MR. TRUEHEART: Just one removed this time, and he has very thick glasses, but he can see better with them than he could before. I don't know just when I will return the suit to him, but pretty soon, I think -- as soon as he is able to feel he has gotten back into the swing of things.

MR. SHELDON: If we go as fast as we did today -- we made more progress today perhaps than we did in many meetings before -- he better hurry up. I don't want to predict because we might reach some stumbling block here that might lock us for meetings.

MR. TRUEHEART: I was prepared to bet we would be here after the 4th of July.

MR. SHELDON: I think we are moving along. The Director asked me this morning how we were coming along, and I told him we were moving rather slowly, but I thought we would eventually come up with some constructive ideas, and the international climate was not such that we needed to meet continually. If we get pressure put on us we can meet more often, but at the moment I think the pace at which we are going is . . . Unless any of the members feel we should press forward faster.

GENERAL LEWIS: Well, it is awfully slow; however, there is an awful lot in my opinion to be done. I just think we are getting started here now with these words. There is a lot to be done and to be highly constructive.

TOP SECRET

TOP SECRET

MR. TRUEHEART: I would have said the thing you have been very much interested in working out -- a world-wide system -- is going to be a very complicated and long time proposition.

GENERAL LEWIS: I don't think so, fellow. I think it is going to be difficult in part, but I don't have any doubt in my mind that it not only can be done at least in part and maybe much more than we think at the moment, and we ought to go out and get representation in from the various theaters, talk to them, and see what we can do, and then we will know how far we can go.

MR. TRUEHEART: I don't question it can be done, but I say it will take a good deal of work by this Committee to get it wrapped up.

GENERAL LEWIS: I don't think it is going to be done in maybe the next 30 or 45 days, but I think it is very important -- very important -- one of the most important things that we can do, and I think we definitely ought to do it. Certainly if we don't nobody else is going to, and I think it is absolutely vital that we try and get those people as geared as much as we can, and it is going to depend an awful lot on their cooperation as to how much we can gear them to get them geared so that we can be mutually beneficial, and actually they can be a lot more beneficial to us then probably than we are going to be to them. But over there in the theaters where the collection occurs, and when you boil all of this thing down, as far as I am concerned it is (one) a question of the will to do it and do it right. We can do it. And the second one depends upon collection, and, by golly, if we can really develop those two things in no uncertain terms and go after this we can improve the process very materially, and we have got to have both of them. After you have the will on the part of everybody, not only here, but out in the theater, and you are not going to have to worry much about will in the theater now. I can tell you this fellow, General Greunther and General Hull over there, boy, they already have it as far as the will to do everything possible to give them warning as far as the theater is concerned, but this collection business is mighty

TOP SECRET

TOP SECRET

important in addition to the will, and they can do much more about that than we can, and even just the stimulation of this, I think, is going to be helpful to us all.

CAPTAIN ELLER: General Lewis, do you feel that we should do that, this Committee, that is, or we should make a recommendation to the IAC that such an action --

GENERAL LEWIS: If we made a recommendation to the IAC some other Committee would pick this thing up, some Committee that doesn't have the background and the desire to make this thing work, you see, and it will just be another Committee somewhere, so in my opinion we ought to do it unless we can find some Committee or activity that would do it more vigorously than we would do it. But I don't think you are going to find it.

MR. SHELDON: I think that is part of our job, Millard. I don't think there is any question about it.

GENERAL LEWIS: Well, it is a job to do it now. If we can find some other activity that is better to do it than we are, that is one thing, but I think that it is part of our job to either do it ourselves or be sure that somebody else is going to do it, and I think it is better for us to do it because you lose a lot of this impetus when you go starting somebody else out fresh with the problem, you see, and then they get to arguing about all of that . . . things that we have argued about here the many hours, you see, and then it takes them 30 or 60 days for them to get to going, and then they get all wound up in somebody's priority somewhere, you see, and that is a major problem, this question of getting mixed up in people's priorities, their own priorities, national priorities, so I am content as far as I am concerned to go ahead and do it, and I think unless we are sure we are going to be turning it over to somebody who could do it better, not equally well, but better, that we ought to be doing it.

MR. SHELDON: I think it is fundamentally our job, and I think we should do it, and I think we should press forward vigorously and tackle the problem.

GENERAL LEWIS: Well, having been over there in the theater and having

TOP SECRET

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~TOP SECRET~~

been working on this exact same problem as my No. 1 job from the day I walked into General Clay's office to be introduced to him as new A-2 of USAFE, it is the first thing he said to me, and I have been working on it ever since. I think I have a good enough idea as to how we could approach it with Europe, and it would be generally the same with FEAF, Alaskan Command, and anybody else we felt important enough to get in here, how we could approach it, and try and find ways and means of bettering . . . And as far as I am concerned, as I said before, the stimulation alone of our doing it is going to be worth it even if we don't set up very much if any machinery. Even if we can't find exactly the mesh of gears to fit, at least the stimulation is going to be good. They will understand our problem. We are going to understand them a lot better.

(There being no further business to come before the Committee,
the meeting adjourned at 12:36 P.M.)

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~TOP SECRET~~